UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,378	12/31/2003	Nir Kol	103580.00024	4888

54975   7590   08/19/2009
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
10 ST. JAMES AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02116-3889

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN KIM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 May 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11 and 14-17</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9, 11, and 14-17</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on May 18, 2009.

Claims 10 and 12-13 have been cancelled, thus claims 1-9, 11 and 14-17 remain pending

in the application.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be

found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1-2, 5-7, and 9, 11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eakin (US 2004/0167896), in view of Mukundan et al (US 6,901,595), and

further in view of Kim et al (US 2002/0065701).

Regarding claim 1, Eakin discloses computer program residing on a computer readable

medium having a plurality of instructions, which, when executed by a processor, cause the

processor to perform operations comprising:

connecting a portal to one or more user interface (UI) components (connecting content

portal 134 to interface 410 and digital assets 110; Figures 1 and 4, ¶[0056-0057]);

linking the one or more UI components to a repository layer and connectivity layer

through an object access layer, the repository layer including metadata (linking digital assets 110

to repository layer 120 and application 130, Figures 1-4, ¶[0035-0037 and 0049-0055]); and

linking the repository layer and the connectivity layer to source system (e.g., linking

repository layer 120 and application 130 to metadata store 128; Figures 1-4, ¶[0035-0036]).

Eakin does not explicitly disclose assessing a database that includes data representing

multiple enterprise functions, wherein the data representing multiple enterprise functions

includes personal tasks and resources for users; and using one or more object modeling tools, one

or more process modeling tool, and the one or more UI component to build components of cross-

functional applications from the data representing multiple enterprise functions, wherein the

cross-functional applications include pages that display the personal tasks and resources for

users.

Mukundan teaches:

assessing a database that includes data representing multiple enterprise functions,

wherein the data representing multiple enterprise functions includes personal tasks and resources

for users (col. 5: lines 32-66, and col. 8: lines19-38); and

using one or more object modeling tools, one or more process modeling tool, and the one

or more UI component to build components of cross-functional applications from the data

representing multiple enterprise functions, wherein the cross-functional applications include

pages that display the personal tasks and resources for users (integration services may be

designed and configured to provide client with user interface and thin client support, e.g.,

exemplary object 605 including CSSWEView 506, CSSWEApplet 508, CSSBusComp 510, CSSBusObj 510, etc. ; Figures 4-5A, col. 8: line 39 – col. 10: line 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mukundan and Eakin, motivated by the need to provide access throughout an enterprise to facilitate process improvement effort.

Eakin-Mukundan does not explicitly call for the metadata pertaining to roles, worksets and personalization information, the metadata configured to interact with at least one template, the at least one template providing a format of information according to preset conditions, the at least one template configured to interact with web application server (WAS) processes and core restructuring processes.

Kim teaches the metadata pertaining to roles, worksets and personalization information (property data represents information on the properties of the business process model, which includes roles, worksets and personalization information; Figures 14-15, ¶[0040-0043 and 0179-0181]), the business process and model configured to interact with at least one template, the at least one template providing a format of information according to preset conditions (¶[0046-0056 and 0071-0082]), the at least one template configured to interact with web application server (WAS) processes and core restructuring processes (¶[0077-0082]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kim's method for automating business processes in Eakin-Mukundan's system, motivated by the need to provide a system and method that can be easily be modified without any major overhaul of the system.

Regarding claim 2, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses input/output (I/O) devices linked to the portal (portal 134 includes interface 410, used to communicate with digital assets providers, reviewers, publishers, and/or consumers; Eakin, Figures 1 and 4, ¶[0057]).

Regarding claims 5-6, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the portal is a common interface that receives requests from clients and generates information views (iViews) in response (Eakin; Figures 6-10, ¶[0072], [0075], [0080], [0085] and [0087]).

Regarding claim 7, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the UI component comprises application navigation components; application integration components; and information views (Eakin; Figures 6-10).

Regarding claim 9, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the repository layer comprises a data object model; and databases including metadata and data, the data including templates (Eakin; Figure 1, ¶[0036-0037] and [0054-0055]).

Regarding claim 11, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the metadata interacts with the object access layer, the connectivity layer and the application logic (Eakin; Figures 1 and 4, ¶[0035-0036]).

Regarding claim 14, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the databases interact with the

source systems through base systems connectors using a markup language (HTML; Eakin,

¶[0030]).

Regarding claim 15, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the databases interact with the

source systems through base systems connectors using web services (Eakin; ¶[0035-0036]).

Regarding claim 16, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim also discloses the databases interact with the

source systems through base systems connectors using TCP/IP (though Eakin-Mukundan does

not explicitly call for using TCP/IP, but since TCP/IP is widely used by the Internet, making it

the de facto standard for transmitting data over networks, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use TCP/IP for interacting between

the databases and the source system).

5.   Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eakin-

Mukundan-Kim as applied to claim 1 above, in view of WAP Forum, "Wireless Application

Protocol White Paper", June 2000.

Regarding claim 3, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim does not explicitly call for the I/O devices are

web devices that communicate with the portal using Wireless Application Protocol and Wireless

Markup Language (WML).

WAP Forum teaches WML as a markup language for WAP technology, adhering to

XML standards (page 10). Thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made the I/O web devices are configured to communicate with the

portal using WAP and WML in order to comply with the industry standards.

Regarding claim 4, Eakin-Mukundan-Kim-WAP Forum also discloses the I/O devices are

Internet browsers that communicate with the portal using HTTP and XML (Eakin; ¶[0043-0044],

and WAP Forum, page 14).

6.   Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Eakin-Mukundan-Kim, in view of Bazinet et al (US 7,260,617), hereinafter Bazinet.

Eakin-Mukundan discloses substantially all the claimed limitations, except the client

requests are coupled to the portal by a proxy server, or source systems communicate with each

other through a firewall.

Bazinet teaches insulating the portal server via firewalls, proxy servers, etc. (col. 3: lines

58-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to couple the portal by a proxy server or allow network communications only through

a firewall in order to improve network security.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Van Kim T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2456

vkn

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446